

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

1. Claim 30 is objected to because it is dependent on cancelled claim 28. Claim 26 is listed in claims but not indicated as pending. Claim 30 has been amended to depend on claim 1, and applicant hereby affirms that claim 26 is pending. Removal of the objections is respectfully requested.
2. Claims 1, 16, 29 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Samuels* (U.S. Patent No. 5,270,821) in view of *Ike* (U.S. Patent No. 5,153,765) and *Stephan* (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,185).
3. Claims 6 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Samuels* in view of *Ike* and *Stephan* as applied to claims 1 and 16, and further in view of *Carroll et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,121,960).
4. Claims 32-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Samuels* in view of *Ike*, *Stephan* and *Carroll et al.*

**Summary of the Response**

Claims 1, 16, 29, 30, 32, and 33 have been amended.

Claim 28 has been cancelled.

Now pending are claims 1, 6, 16, 26, 29, 30, and 32-35.

**Claim 1, 16, and 32**

Claims 1, 16, and 32, as amended, require a mechanism having the following features:

- (1) a portable computer on which an image screen is disposed;

(2) a display of user graphical user-elements on the image screen, which are displayed in response to an activation signal from a first input mechanism and with which user interaction causes the adjustment of viewing parameters; and

(3) the display of the user graphical user-elements is caused by a process running under the control of an operating system on a portable computer system.

The cited art fails to disclose or suggest the above features.

In rejecting claim 1, the Office Action relies primarily on *Samuels*. Presumably, the Office Action has equated the portable computer to which an image screen is disposed to the video display with a micro-controller taught by *Samuels*, and the graphical user interface elements to the “on-screen menu” controlled by the micro-controller. Even if this analogy were correct, which it is not, *Samuels* fails to disclose or suggest all the above features or modify its teachings to provide the above features.

Claim 1 requires that the display of the graphical user-interface elements is caused by a process running on a portable computer and running under the control of the operating system of the portable computer. While the on-screen menu is controlled by the video display’s micro-controller, there is no suggestion in *Samuels* that the micro-controller is configured to execute an operating system, let alone one that controls a process capable of causing display of graphical user-interface elements, as required by claim 1.

Nor does *Samuels* suggest in any way to modify its teachings to incorporate such features, such as an operating system. *Samuels*’ teachings do not suggest in any way nor do they motivate the incorporation of an operating system into a video display, such as a CRT, let alone the incorporation of a process that runs under control of the operating system and that can cause a display of graphical user interface-elements. Applicant has also found no teaching in *Stephan* or *Ike* that suggest incorporating these features in a video display.

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1, 16, and 32 are patentable. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1, 16, and 32 is respectfully requested.

**Dependant Claims**

The pending claims not discussed so far are dependant claims that depend on an independent claim that is discussed above. Because each of the dependant claims include the limitations of claims upon which they depend, the dependant claims are patentable for at least those reasons the claims upon which the dependant claims depend are patentable. Removal of the rejections with respect to the dependant claims and allowance of the dependant claims is respectfully requested. In addition, the dependent claims introduce additional limitations that independently render them patentable. Due to the fundamental difference already identified, a separate discussion of those limitations is not included at this time.

**CONCLUSION**


Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is requested by Applicants. Should any issues preclude allowance of this application, Applicant urges the Examiner to telephone Applicants' attorney at (408) 414-1209. The Office is given permission to charge any unpaid fees to Applicants' deposit account (50-1302).

Respectfully submitted,

HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Dated: June 3, 2003

1600 Willow Street  
San Jose, California 95125-5106  
Telephone No.: (408) 414-1080  
Facsimile No.: (408) 414-1076

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Marcel K. Bingham, Reg. No. 42,327

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

on June 3, 2003 by Trudy Bagdon